DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 011 40 IR 001 193

AUTHOR	Coffing, Richard T.; And Others
TITLE	A Hypothetical Application of a Needs Analysis Methodology for Special Education Materials: A Scenario. Project MORE Technical Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Kansas Univ., Lawrence. Bureau of Child Research.; Parsons State Hospital and Training Center, Kans.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	MORE-TR-2
PUB DATE	Aug 74
GRANT	OEG-0-71-0449(607)
NOTE	22p.; For related documents see IR 001 192-198
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Needs; Educational Technology; *Exceptional Child Research; Instructional Materials; Media Selection; Mentally Handicapped; *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	Mediated Operational Research for Education; National Needs Analysis Design; Needs Assessment; Project MORE

ABSTRACT

A scenario illustrates how a prescriptive set of rules and procedures for identifying, defining, and measuring needs (a needs analysis methodology) can be applied to determining the need for instructional materials for severely-moderately retarded persons. The scenario describes hypothetically how a needs analyst with the National Needs Analysis Design might implement the three basic steps in the design: (1) identifying information users' concerns for information needs, (2) obtaining and reporting definitions of needs, and (3) obtaining and reporting measurement of need fulfillment. After reporting the result the needs analyst might begin a second iteration with other needs, needers, and/or definers of concern. In addition the needs analyst evaluates the utility of the information. The answers would be used by the needs analyst to revise the application of needs analysis procedures and to modify the procedures themselves, as necessary. (WCM)

ED 097011

PROJECT MORE®

Mediated Operational Research for Education

Technical Report No. 2

August 1974

A Hypothetical Application of a Needs Analysis Methodology for Special Education Materials: A Scenario

Richard T. Coffing [1]

Ingo Keilitz

Donita Ingenthron

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Technical Reports are intended primarily for communication among Project MORE staff and their professional colleagues. Distribution is at the discretion of Project MORE. Quotation of or reference to these reports is permitted only with the permission of the author(s). This report was prepared pursuant to Grant No. 0-71-0449(607) with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

[1]Richard T. Coffing is with the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH), The Ohio State University, 220 West 12th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. The NCEMMH is funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education.

©1974 by The University of Kansas (Project MORE)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

PROJECT MORE

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

IR 001 193

A HYPOTHETICAL APPLICATION OF A NEEDS ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION MATERIALS: A SCENARIO

Educational technology, with its general concern for means-ends relationships, has failed to place the proper emphasis on judgments of worth, value, and need. This has led to situations where educators possess the viable educational models and techniques to take students someplace, but must decide for themselves where to go. The tools are available, but what needs to be built remains an open question. The educational dilemma created by a well oiled educational technology relatively devoid of determinations of what is good and what is needed has produced cries for justifications of educational goals in general and behavioral objectives in particular. The response to demands for increased attention to need determinations has been vociferous to the degree that a "need assessment litany," as House (1973) has called it, has been woven into most educational programs. Unfortunately, this accountability at the front end, the specification of the importance of educational ends, has been largely superficial and narrow (Stake & Gooler, 1973; House, 1973).

This scenario attempts to provide an instructive illustration of how a prescriptive set of rules and procedures for identifying, defining, and measuring needs, i.e., a needs analysis methodology, can be applied to determining the need for instructional materials for severely-moderately retarded persons. No attempt will be made to describe in detail the need analysis methodology; for this the reader is referred to a detailed description of the National Needs Analysis Design (Coffing, Thomann, Mattson,

& Merriman, 1974). This scenario is simply a case study of an application of a need analysis methodology.

The scenario describes hypothetically how a Needs Analyst with the National Needs Analysis Design has implemented three basic steps in the Design: (1) Identifying Information Users' Concerns for Information about Needs, (2) Obtaining and Reporting Definitions of Needs, and (3) Obtaining and Reporting Measurement of Need Fulfillment. Several decisions have preceeded the Needs Analyst's activity in this scenario:

-- With the widest feasible advice from appropriate persons in education, government, business, and voluntary agencies serving the handicapped, it has been decided that a high priority group of people to be provided with information about needs are the staffs of existing instructional materials development projects that are funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education,

-- One of the information users provided with some information about needs early in the National Needs Analysis is the staff of the "Daily-Living Skills Project" in Denver, Colorado. This project is developing instructional materials for the training of severely-moderately retarded individuals, and

-- The Daily-Living Skills (DLS) Project staff have been contacted by the National Needs Analysis staff as to (a) their willingness to participate and (b) the availability of their time and other resources necessary to supplement National Needs Analysis resources.

A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION USERS' CONCERNS

Once the priorities for the National Needs Analysis had been determined, one of the Needs Analysts contacted the Director of the Daily-Living Skills Project and arranged for a one day meeting at the Project office in Denver.

Included in this meeting were the Director and Assistant Director of the Project, as well as several of the Instructional Developers.

In Denver, at the beginning of the meeting, the Needs Analyst orally summarized the purpose and design of the Project and answered questions about the design. The DLS Director had previously sent the Needs Analyst some materials that described the purpose and nature of the DLS Project, and the Needs Analyst asked some questions about the DLS Project in order to expand her understanding.

She first asked the individual staff members to say something about their roles with the Project in order to cause them to focus on their decision-making responsibilities. She then asked the staff to identify decisions that they make with respect to development of the instructional materials. For purposes of the scenario, not all of the decisions that the staff listed will be included here, but some of them were:

1. Decide what needs should be addressed,
2. Decide what sub-components of certain needs should be addressed by special programs,
3. Decide what sub-components should have priority over other sub-components, since certain behaviors may be more generally needed than others,
4. Determine a sequence for development of training programs,
5. Decide whether there are available resources and time,
6. Decide how much effort--time and resources--should go into program design, development, and dissemination,
7. Determine the content of individual training programs,
8. Decide on the task breakdown to be prescribed for the children,

9. Determine prerequisite skills, age range, and physical and behavioral characteristics of potential recipients of program application within the target population, and

10. Determine the procedures that are to be used by the teachers in training the children in each program.

Then the Needs Analyst asked the staff to identify decisions about media and materials that they might want to make in the future. The staff indicated that in the future they would make the same kinds of decisions as above, plus the following:

11. What additional programs should be developed in the future, given the reality-based restrictions of federal funding?

In the course of naming the decisions they either made or wanted to make, one of the staff members mentioned that the staff already had some information about needs and they had been using it in making some decisions. Therefore the Needs Analyst next asked, "What kinds of information about needs do you have available to you?" Staff members replied that they have available to them a few sources beyond their personal experiences in training these children. These sources suggest and indicate information about needs as compiled by researchers, curriculum specialists, and other professionals in the field of mental retardation and related fields. Written sources of information include the following:

-- Residential Programming for Mentally Retarded Persons

-- Cain Levine Social Competency Scale

-- Nebraska Client Process System

-- Adaptive Behavior Checklist

-- Vineland Social Maturity Scale

-- Kansas Neurological Institute Development Checklist

In listing these sources of information, the Needs Analyst took note of some gratuitous comments by the staff that these sources varied in format and varied in audiences, and that the sources were not entirely adequate for the development of specific materials to meet needs. The Needs Analyst decided not to examine that issue further at this point, but rather asked another question of the staff.

The question was, "With respect to your decisions and roles here in the DLS Project, whose needs are you concerned about meeting?" Answers to this question began the formulation of the basic needs analysis phrase: "Who needs what, as defined by whom." One of the staff members said that the target population for the Project was "trainers of severely and moderately retarded persons." Another staff person added the explanation that "severely or moderately retarded" referred to what might otherwise be called the category of "trainable mentally retarded." The Project was using two of the categories designated by the American Association of Mental Deficiency. The staff, however, added that they were concerned about meeting the needs of severely or moderately retarded students, and in that sense the students were the target population. However, the Project's products would be put in the hands of teachers in order to modify teacher behavior. Hopefully, the teachers would then be able to modify the behavior of the students. The connection with students consequently was considered to be less direct by the Project staff.

The Needs Analyst asked the staff to detail further the categories of people whose needs the staff is concerned about meeting. The staff's

list of "needers" was as follows (this is the partial list for purposes of the scenario):

-- Severely or moderately retarded children,

-- Instructional staff, which is comprised of

(a) institutional aides,
(b) teachers in the institution,
(c) direct care personnel,
(d) other institutional staff,

-- Special education teachers of the severely or moderately retarded, and

-- Parents of the severely or moderately retarded.

The next question was, "Again with respect to your decisions and roles in the DLS Project, what kinds of needs are you concerned about meeting?" The staff replied that the Project was aimed at meeting needs for "systematic validated daily-skill programs." This, they said, was the only important category of need that they wanted to be concerned about at this time. Since they expressed it that way, the Needs Analyst decided not to press further for other needs which they might also be concerned about meeting.

The following question related to focusing the staff's concerns for information about needs, "Who can define specifically those needs of those persons?"

Project DLS had been underway for more than a year and a half at the time the Needs Analyst first contacted them. In that period of time the staff of the Project had already identified some 40 program areas they felt should be given priority for development. The priorities were derived after reading literature available in the field, including

the information sources that have been mentioned above. Nine training programs had already been completed in certain areas of personal cleanliness. These included programs on washing one's self, brushing teeth, and shaving. Under contract with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the Project was committed to the development of certain additional programs. These included using restrooms, several programs in the care of simple injuries, several programs in using electronic communication devices such as telephones and television, following directions, asking for directions, handling certain medical emergencies, and listening to others. These program categories, in effect, represented a further specification of the broad category of need which the staff had called "systematic daily-living skill programs."

In response to the question of who could best define the children's needs for daily-living skills and the trainer's needs for systematic programs relative to those skills, the staff identified the following potential definers:

-- Students,
-- Teaching aides,
-- Training directors,
-- Parents,
-- Courts,
-- Parent advocate organizations,
-- Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals,
-- Special educators, and
-- Curriculum specialists and other professionals.

The staff indicated that deciding who should specify what the needs are had been a real problem for the Project. Basically, the staff was concerned about getting needs defined by people who are directly responsible for the children. However, they felt that certain persons who have direct insti-

tutional contact with these children might define the needs too narrowly. That is, if an institution is not teaching a certain set of skills, then the institutional staff may not say those skills are needed. This attitude would constitute justification of the status quo. Further, needs can be defined so ambiguously, so broadly, that the definition is nonfunctional, such as in a situation where "coping with life" is indicated as a training need. With such an ambiguous need posture, specification, implementation, and evaluation is impossible. Ideally, the DLS Project staff said, they would like to have the children themselves define the needs, but they said this would be practically impossible. The staff discussion centered around trying to identify some more objective definers of needs, and the consensus of the staff seemed to be that such persons would be people who are not now directly connected with either federal projects or institutions. (We all, as a matter of practical necessity and expediency, have some operational priorities. What we need are some logical, replicable, credible ways of representing them.) Rather, the definers would be professional advocates for the children, who could be identified through the assistance of advocate organizations such as the National Association for Retarded Children.

The Needs Analyst next asked the staff to put the list of needers into priority order according to "the importance of meeting their needs." At first the staff identified the institutional staff persons as the most important needers (for systematic programs on daily-living skills), next were special education teachers, third were parents of severely or moderately retarded children. After considering that priority ranking a few minutes, however, the staff decided the highest priority would be the students, even though the Project was preparing materials for teachers and other persons to use. Then would come the three priority-ordered adult groups.

The Needs Analyst next asked if the staff had a further breakdown of daily-living skills. The staff referred to the list of program areas which had been either proposed or produced in their current contract for programs. The Needs Analyst asked the staff to say whether having information about needs for certain program areas was more important than for other program areas on the list. The staff said they had no real information on importance, and would find it difficult to rank-order the kinds of needs (or programs) using a criterion of "importance," since all the skill (program) areas appear to be "important" according to the literature and the staff's own sense.

Given the staff's hesitation, the Needs Analyst asked them to consider the work schedule they had already developed for producing training programs, and decide for which program they would first want information about needs, for which one second, and so forth; in other words, the Needs Analyst asked the staff to choose a time sequence for obtaining information about needs, given whatever scheduling they are committed to by contract. In this way, the Needs Analyst was able to begin working out a plan for gathering data that would be geared to usage of the information according to the Project's work plan. In this sense, the need analysis must fit the Project's schedule, rather than the Project fitting the needs analysis' schedule. Given the criterion of "temporal sequence," the staff said that they were most concerned about having needs information for the program area called "using the telephone." After that, they would want information about needs for "receiving and following simple directions," then for "care of simple injuries."

After they had priority-ordered the list of needs, the Needs Analyst asked the staff to combine their list of needers with their list of needs to generate all the logical combinations. Then they chose the combination

of "who needs what" which they would first want information about, providing that information might be available in three months. With that proviso, the staff decided that they most wanted information about "students' needs for skills in use of the telephone."

Since the Project staff had named some literature as being available to them, the Needs Analyst considered the literature as a potential source of definition of needs. If literature known to the Project were already sufficient, it would not be a wise use of resources to establish other sources of information about needs. Consequently, the Needs Analyst asked the staff to say whether the literature was adequate and, if not, what information was lacking.

The staff had referred to the previously-mentioned literature as being sources of information written by professionals in the field of mental retardation who are not connected with the DLS Project or its goals. The staff wanted to make that point because they felt it was important that they would be getting information from outside their own experience.

According to the staff, this literature potentially applied to all the programs and products the DLS Project was working on. The Need Analyst asked, "Are you citing these as the basic sources for needs information for all the programs?" A staff member replied, "Yes, for all the programs. But, again I should say that they will not suffice. We don't get the information we need from them." Still following up, the Needs Analyst asked, "Can you be more specific about what is lacking in this information?" One staff member replied as follows:

> Let me give you an example. The National Association for Retarded Children has indicated certain "suggested areas

of program emphasis for moderately retarded residents." In the category called "self-care, grooming, and hygiene" there is a listing (Number 2) "improving personal appearance, dressing appropriately for non-retarded peers, caring for and purchasing personal clothing items." The problem with this category is: the objective is so vaguely stated and so ambiguous that we still do not know if a specific skill needs to be trained or not. The objectives in the literature we have cited are so ambiguous, global, and cloudy that the curriculum developer who has to get to the nitty-gritty details does not know whether or not the program he finally decides to develop is really needed. If we decided to develop a program on "The Use of the Spoon," does that jibe with what this document cites as the need, or does it not? We still don't know that. Surely, it goes under the category of being able to eat properly, but is that what they are looking for? We still don't have an answer to whether or not specific skills are needed.

The Needs Analyst asked, "Then if you had your choice -- again, going back to the kinds of people who might be able to define the needs very specifically -- would you go to somebody other than the professionals? The aides, for example, or the parents, or ..." A staff member replied,

> Let me answer you this way. If the student could clearly and consisely express his own needs either through demonstrations or through having him just go through his daily routine and see what is missing -- it would be the surest method to have him define his own needs. But that's almost impossible, or at least highly impractical, from a measurement or methodological viewpoint. Therefore, I think we would rather have the professionals in the field define the needs.

Since the literature had been a problem for the Project staff, the Needs Analyst wanted to check further on the validity of the direct contact with the professionals, from the point of views of the Project staff. The Needs Analyst said,

> Now if we were to go to some professionals that you would name with reference to a specific kind of need say, "eye contact," and ask those persons to imagine the

need being fulfilled in the case of some real kids, and ask the professionals to say what would happen if the need were completely fulfilled, would you believe that most of those professionals would be able to provide specificity in response to that kind of question?

"Would they specify the outcomes?" a staff member responded. "Yes, no doubt. They would be able to say things like, 'I would like to have the outcome of the program be that Jimmy and Johnny look at me when I'm talking to them, that they don't look someplace else and miss half of the things I'm saying.' Yes, they would know what eye contact is."

The Needs Analyst asked further, "Would this be true also with other programs that you are interested in having information about?" The staff members replied, "Yes." "Then let me repeat a question," said the Needs Analyst. "Do you know anywhere in any existing literature or needs assessment studies or any other kinds of studies where that specificity is available?" The staff did not. "So in your judgment," the Needs Analyst said, "it is going to require going to those professionals with the appropriate questions and getting the answers directly from them?" A staff member said, "That's right, to the best of our knowledge." The Needs Analyst then commented that it was important to know what sources the staff had checked. The Needs Analyst would also search for additional sources if a needs analysis were carried out. These sources, she noted, would be provided to the staff for any possible use.

Then the Needs Analyst asked the Project staff to name some professionals either by category or by specific names whom they would respect to provide specific definitions of needs for the kinds of needs that the Project is most interested in. The staff responded that the definers they were most interested in getting need definitions from are people

(1) who are in the field of mental retardation, (2) who have direct contact with the students themselves, (3) who are advocates for the severely-moderately retarded, and (4) who have no specific allegiance or bias toward any federally funded project or any kind of specific approach to mental retardation. The Needs Analyst asked the staff how to locate such people, and the staff recommended that the search be made through the National Association for Retarded Children, which might provide assistance.

Second, the staff wanted to have trainers of the severely or moderately retarded define the needs as long as the "advocate" professionals' definitions were provided, too, as a kind of validity and reliability check.

In the particular hypothetical conditions of this scenario, it is assumed that only a very small amount of money is available for measuring the extent to which needs are being fulfilled. (This may be the case for a number of needs analysis studies.) Therefore the Needs Analyst determined to check whether the staff would utilize estimates of need fulfillment that might be obtained from the definers at the time the definers provide their definitions. The Needs Analyst explained there would be a number of threats to reliability and validity.

The Needs Analyst asked the staff if the definers they had just described would be reasonable persons also to provide direct observations of the extent to which needs they have defined were being met. The staff in effect said, "No, the job is too big." "Then you think," said the Needs Analyst, "that they couldn't tell us how much, to what extent, those needs or attributes of needs were not occuring in this population of children?" "They would be able to make estimates, yes," replied the staff. "But not based upon empirical research -- just based upon their experiences." "Then would you want us to try to get estimates from them?" the Needs Analyst asked. The staff agreed that they would want such information,

especially since they had been informed that very few measurement resources were available at this time.

The staff then settled on some specific needs analyses phrases that the Needs Analyst would be expected to provide information about initially. These three priority phrases in the form, "Who needs what, as defined by whom" were:

-- Trainable mentally retarded students' needs for using the telephone, as defined by professional "advocates,"

-- Trainable mentally retarded students' needs for using the telephone, as defined by their teachers or trainers,

-- Needs of teachers' of such students for programs to train the use of telephone.

In concluding the identifying of information users' concerns, which was the purpose of this meeting in Denver, the Needs Analyst obtained specific citation of all the literature which the staff of this Project had come across. The staff and the Needs Analyst talked a little more about the process that they had been through, and then the Needs Analyst asked a very important question concerning the process and the National Needs Analysis Design. If the answer to this next question were negative, then there would be a serious question of whether to proceed. The Needs Analyst asked, "Would you please seriously consider this needs analysis process that you have experienced and, to some extent, read about? Now, let me ask, does the process of needs analysis that has been described and that you have experienced today have 'face validity,' at least, to you? The staff members replied, "Yes, it does." The Needs Analyst continued, "Pressing further, do you want to participate in a study where you are the information user or decision maker, and in which that design is employed for the

purposes of providing you with information about needs?" A staff member replied and the group clearly agreed:

> No doubt about it. It has face validity and that's why we are talking with you. It's one of the few methodologies that does deal with needs assessment, and we need something like that. We would feel a lot more comfortable if we had some ways that . . . if decisions don't come out to jibe with our personal feelings, we could deal with that problem later on. We want to be able to point to a system of coming up with these priorities. We don't want this Project to just be going on the "seat of its pants."

After hearing this last reply and others that the staff had made during the day, the Needs Analyst was satisfied that the Project staff would ascribe "decision-maker validity" to the process. This assumption meant that it was reasonable to continue the study to the next stage: obtaining definitions of needs.

B. OBTAINING AND REPORTING DEFINITIONS OF NEEDS

In carrying out the second objective, the Needs Analyst reviewed whatever literature could be found that seemed to relate to the highest priority "who needs what" identified by the DLS Project staff: The desire to have information about trainable mentally retarded students' needs for learning to use the telephone. This review of literature included an analysis of the documents that the Project staff had already referred to, because it was conceivable that they had overlooked some specificity that might be found in that literature. The review did turn up some categories of literature related to use of the telephone, and the Needs Analyst abstracted those for purposes of adding to the definition of need at a later stage. Some additional literature was located and abstracted.

The Needs Analyst contacted the National Association for Retarded Children in order to identify potential "advocate" definers of the need. Additional sources were used for access of trainers. A list of people

was developed over a period of several weeks and those people were contacted to see if they were willing to participate. Fourteen advocates and 21 trainers agreed to spend up to several hours each assisting in the needs analysis. The least amount of time which any definers said they would make available was an hour.

The needs Analyst prepared a defining question and reviewed it with the staff of the DLS Project. The staff wanted some modifications in the wording, which were made, and the defining question was approved as follows:

> Some or all moderately or severely mentally retarded persons may need to use telephone communication or respond to telephone communications. We are interested in defining very specifically what those persons' needs really are for use of the telephone. Please respond to the following question on the basis of your actual experience with such persons and out of your knowledge of their needs.
>
> Imagine that some moderately or severely retarded persons are using the telephone as fully as they need to. In that situation, you see them actually making and receiving calls. In that situation, which may be a public place, home, or other setting, there are one or more telephone instruments and anything else that the retarded person needs in order to use the phone. As you think of the situation, examine carefully what the retarded person is doing and saying. Write down in the space provided below everything the retarded person might be doing in order to take care of his needs with respect to telephone communications.

A sample of eight definers in each population (advocates, trainers) was asked to respond to the open-ended question. They responded by saying things like "the person is able to dial a seven-digit number, is able to answer the telephone, is able to dial zero and give the operator some information," and so forth. All of their responses were analyzed into individual attributes (components) of the general need to use telephone communications. These attributes were combined into a list and converted into a survey to be sent to the larger group of the definers.

In addition, because the Project staff wanted to receive some measurement information in the form of estimates from these definers, some provision was made in the survey instrument to obtain very rough estimates of the extent to which the individual attributes were occuring. In other words, the definers were asked to estimate the extent to which the need was being fulfilled, in their experience, in terms of the components of the need. The definers were asked to respond to the basic question that was described above, but in this case they were given the set of attributes that they had produced in response to the open-ended question, plus additional attributes that had been gleaned from the literature, a total of 97 attributes in all. The attributes from the literature were justifiable as "tests of completeness" that were built into the instrument, and the definers were told that the attributes they were being asked to identify were mostly from their peers, but, to some extent, were derived from the literature (which of course, may also have been a contribution of their peers). The definers were asked to make a check mark beside each attribute that they felt was an attribute of severely or moderately retarded persons and they were asked to circle the ten most important attributes of need. They were also asked to estimate whether each attribute that they checked was, for this population, "completely met," or "not met."

The survey instrument was sent. Each of the definers thus was able to consider all of the attributes provided by themselves and all other definers. A partial list of the hypothetical results of this second round survey (from advocates only) is shown in Figure 1, ranked according to weighted score.

Figure 1

Hypothetical Results of Second-Round Survey of Advocates: Definition and Estimate of Fulfillment of Trainable Mentally Retarded Children's Needs for Use of Telephone

N = 14. Weight represents one point for each time an attribute was checked as being needed, plus ten points for each time an attribute was marked as being among the ten most important attributes of the need.

			Estimated Extent of Need Fulfillment			
Rank	Weight	Attribute	Met	Somewhat Met	Not Met	Total
1	71	Say "Hello" and tell who is speaking: "Hello, this is.."	15%	27%	58%	100%
2	70	Receive a call in order to relay a message orally	12%	31%	57%	100%
3	68	Get to phone when it rings before five rings	23%	27%	50%	100%
4	67	Hold receiver with mouth piece next to mouth and ear piece next to ear	19%	36%	45%	100%
4	67	Listen to operator	23%	29%	48%	100%
6	63	Dial "0" and give information	9%	19%	72%	100%
*						
*						
*						
97	9	Call Long Distance Person-to-Person	2%	7%	91%	100%

These results were reported to the Project staff, along with a description of the methods used to obtain this definitional information. Surprisingly for the DLS staff, the two definer groups (advocate and trainers) defined the needs and estimated the fulfillment very much alike. This was a small sample of the two groups of potential definers. It was not randomly selected from a known total population of advocates or trainers. The definers were not employing a specific observation plan for estimating need fulfillment. The Project staff was cautioned about potential threats to validity and reliability.

In addition, the report of definitional information was sent by the Needs Analyst to the operators of the National Instructional Materials Information System for inclusion in the Needs Analysis section of that System and a copy of the report was given to the dissemination staff of the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. The report was included in the catalog of all needs information available to anyone from the National Needs Analysis project. A copy of the report was included in the quarterly report to the Project Officer for NCEMMH.

C. OBTAINING AND REPORTING MEASUREMENTS OF NEED FULFILLMENT

Because of the limited resources, the only measurement information that was gathered was the estimates of need fulfillment made by the definers as reported in Figure 1.

Next Steps

The scenario has reflected in simplified form only a single iteration of certain steps in needs analysis. With the reporting of the information, however, the Needs Analyst might immediately have begun a second iteration with other needs, needers, and/or definers of concern to the DLS Project staff, or the staff might have requested greater specificity regarding certain attributes of using the telephone. There are a number of possibilities.

One activity the Needs Analyst undertakes after reporting the information is to evaluate the utility of the information. She asks, "What reported information was used by whom for making what decisions?," "How well focused was the information in terms of the information users' ranking importance of the decisions?," and "What additional information about needs would have been or would be useful in making those decisions?" The answers would be used by the Needs Analyst to revise her application of needs analysis procedures and to modify the procedures themselves, as necessary.

The DLS Project staff made use of the information as part of the following decisions (a partial list):

-- To develop separate programs for simple use of telephone, emergency calling, and coin-operated telephone use,

-- To defer indefinitely any programming for long distance calling,

-- To ask for needs analysis centered on each of the remaining programs scheduled in the DLS Project, and

-- To ask for a broad study of needs for daily-living skills in order to provide overall priority information for the next few years.

REFERENCES

Coffing, R. T., Thomann, J. B., Mattson, C. T., & Merriman, P. S. A national needs analysis design: Draft II. Columbus, Ohio: The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, 1974.

House, E. R. Technology and evaluation. Educational Technology, 1973, 13, 20-26.

National Association for Retarded Children. Residential programming for mentally retarded persons. Arlington, Tex: NARC, 1973.

Stake, R. E., & Gooler, D. D. measuring educational priorities. In E. R. House (Ed.), School evaluation: The politics and the process. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing, 1973.